

The Bloody Story of Anti-Semitism Down the Ages

**A FEW FRIENDLY COUNSELS OF A FREETHINKER TO THE
MEMBERS OF OUR THREE GREAT RELIGIONS**

By Joseph McCabe

**HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS**

FOREWORD

In the year 1779, when Germany had recovered from the appalling devastation which the struggle of Catholic and Protestant in the Thirty Years War had brought upon it, one of its most learned scholars, Lessing, wrote a book, "Nathan the Wise," in which he gently rebuked religious bitterness. It was in the form of a dialogue between a Catholic, Protestant, and a Jew. Lessing had taken the idea from one of Boccaccio's stories, "The Three Rings." In this the famous and genial story-teller had turned aside from dalliance and naughty adventures and had given his distracted world the finest moral counsel that any wicked man had ever yet given it. From his superior position of a mere sensualist he had urged these Arabs, Jews, and Christians, who took the Fatherhood of God so seriously that they cut each others' throats over differences in the conception, to see that life would be much sweeter for everybody if they concentrated rather on the Brotherhood of Man. The idea was not new. It had occurred to many, both Arabs and Jews, in the brilliant and skeptical Arab-Persian Empire which a few centuries earlier had spanned the earth from Portugal to Baluchistan.

We seem, amongst other strang things, to be back in the intolerant medieval bitterness, and I propose to renew these old counsels and enforce them with the larger knowledge of our age. I have, alas, neither the graceful irony of Boccaccio nor the solid learning of Lessing, but I may claim one virtue for such a task. It is a peculiar feature of writings of this kind that the less seriously the author takes the religion which he represents the more seriously and effectively he tries to promote human welfare and peace. Boccaccio was a Humanist, Lessing a Deist. I have the advantage that I do not care about these three historic religions or any kind of religion, and this may enable me to see more clearly the greater human truth to which they must all submit.

I. THE BROAD VIEW

Our age is probably the richest mixture of tragedy and comedy, of suffering and frothy entertainment, of stupidity and intellectual triumph, upon which the sun has yet shone. White-faced oracles assure it that it has to make a choice between the complete collapse of civilization and rising within 10 to 20 years to a level of prosperity that is as high above that of 1938 as this was raised above the state of the world in 1838, yet two-thirds of the race shrug their shoulders and get on with the dance. In particular it has to make a choice between what statesmen now politely call power-politics—it used to be called Might is Right—and the settlement of national and international problems in the white light of justice. And what are called the world's "great religions," which have ever boasted that they lead the race in the paths of justice, lean everywhere to power-politics.

In North America, the most powerful church not only seeks power for itself but it dons a national costume and supports the vilest apostles of power-politics in the country. In South America, it cordially supports the bullies and military dictators of a dozen states; as it does in Spain and Portugal and would, if there were a chance, do in France, Belgium, Italy, and other European countries. Both branches of the Christian church as well as the Taoist priests and Buddhist monks, support in their own interest a blood-stained, blundering bully in China. In India, the grand opportunity of ending centuries of slavery is gravely threatened by the bitter mutual hatred of the rival religions, Islam and Hinduism; and in Nearer Asia, the poisonous clash of Jew and Moslem is blindly indifferent to the fact that it may culminate in a savage war. And with supreme irony we are told on every side that these three religions are the basis of civilization and—at the very time when grave writers wonder whether we are not on the verge of annihilation—we are assured that our happy and virtuous world may *become* confused and evil if we do not listen to our religious guides.

Here we take one of these problems, the problem of Palestine. And while it is the aggressive violence of the militant Zionists, the fight of Jew and Christian, that fills the mind when we turn to consider that problem today, we must not lose sight of a fact which gives the Jew a unique incentive to bitterness. The Jewish is the only race in the world that has no country, and in our age of inflated nationalism that fact lends itself to emotional oratory. No serious person will appeal to the analogy of the Gypsies, who, as far as we know, never had a country and do not claim one. The nearest parallel to the Jewish dispersal is that of the Irish, for at least 12,000,000 people of Irish descent are now found scattered over the United States and the British Empire. But these have no wish to leave the comfortable homes they have won overseas. Their patriotism is satisfied to reflect that, small and unenterprising as Eire is, it is the land of the Irish, and they easily persuade themselves that it has had a long and glorious history as such. For nearly 2,000 years the Jew has had no homeland, no history, no race as other nations understand the word. He is at the best a paying guest in somebody else's national home: at the worst a pariah dog to be suffered to wander the streets until some adventurer raises the anti-Semitic cry. When the word goes round that the British nation has given him the title-deeds, not merely to a country, but to the land which—he believes—his fathers made happy and prosperous, we can understand the vigor of the response. If this happens just when the tragic precariousness

of depending upon other races for a home reveals, as it has done in our time, all its ghastly possibilities, we scarcely wonder that the Jews fight for the fulfilment of the promise.

We shall see later what truth or exaggeration there is in all this. For the moment it is well to realize how the Jew sees the situation. It is useless to remind him that he is not necessarily an alien in the lands of others, especially not in the United States. In all countries the mixture of races has been considerable—the modern English, as they call themselves, are a fusion of Britons, Angles, Saxons, Danes, and Normans with generous additions of German, French, Italian, and Irish blood—but in the United States there is no original race which received and absorbed later immigrants. Spanish, French, Dutch, English, Poles, Italians are not the guests of the American race. They are the race. They may keep their religions and their customs, but they feel themselves neither guests nor strangers in an American land. The land back across the sea is not their land and they have no aspiration to return to it. Broad fringes of poverty they have round each of their racial bodies but instead of raising funds to send their poorer fellow-Irish or Italians back to the homeland, they make every effort to attract more from it and boast that they have found a more comfortable home in America.

One reason for the different attitude of the Jews is that they are more isolated from the rest of the community than the French, Italians, the Czechs, Poles, and Irish, are. By a curious and not yet understood process of nature they, or most of them, differ at a glance from all other members of the community. Science is not yet in a position to explain that peculiarity of nose which distinguished a part of the Jewish race from all others. In the Middle Ages this was part of the brand of Cain that the Almighty had put upon them. Today we know that it is not a peculiarity of the Jew. It is found amongst the Turks of Asia Minor and the Armenians, and inscriptions in Asia Minor show that it was a common racial feature of the Hittites, a people who for thousands of years filled and dominated Asia Minor. History tells how just in the centuries when the ancestors of the Jews settled in Palestine these Hittites flowed south over Syria, but there is nothing in Hebrew or general history to explain why their peculiar physiognomy passed to the Hebrews, who, as a Semitic race, should have the straight nose of the Arab. It is in itself a small point but everybody knows how much it counts for where there is any degree of anti-Semitism in a community. It is priceless to the anti-Semitic cartoonist; and today, when millions have ceased to read, the cartoonist is a power.

More important is the clannishness which causes some Jews to agglutinate in close, sometimes almost impenetrable, bodies in the cities in which they settle. In modern America they tend to scatter more, but the American must remember that the modern problem of the Jew is mainly created by European, not American, conditions, though in comparatively old and maritime cities like New York the unfortunate results of this clannishness are clearly seen. I remember once, after lunch in the Century Club, discussing this question with the author of "The Passing of the Great White Race," a bitter critic of the Jews. We sat at a side-window and, waving his hand over the East Side, he said: "We have half a million Jews packed together, aliens to us, in that square mile or so." He muttered something foolish about machine guns. . . . It was a vivid aspect of the problem of the Jew.

Behind this racial coherence is, of course, the whole history of the Jews for the past 2,000 years, the bitter experience of the ghetto, the furtive shrinking age after age from an enemy all round who might at any time turn to rape and rapine. But even in modern conditions there is the same tendency to racial isolation, and here the Jewish religion begins to share the blame. The minister of religion has been exposed to a peculiar temptation ever since Jesus stood on a pinnacle of the temple while the devil sat on the weather-cock and chaffed him.

He wants to see all the kingdoms of the world brought in to his religion, and while this sentiment is hallowed by the dogma that this is the surest, if not the only, way of men to secure their eternal salvation, he cannot be blind to the fact that it would mean a vast increase of wealth and power to the clergy. Losses may or may not be dangerous to the supernatural interests of the individuals who fall away but they do clearly reduce the wealth and power of the clerical body. Wherever, therefore, members of the religious organization wander into a land where their sect is in a small minority, the priest or rabbi at least urges them to keep together in sufficient numbers to be able to afford a humble place of worship and a third-rate pastor. Even this is apt to be organized in our age of scientific efficiency. A London attorney told me that he once had instructions and a fat fee from a pious French lady who was sending her son to study at London University. His instructions were to find the youth a mistress, in order to preserve his virtue, and a home near a Catholic chapel.

Apart from personal feelings, therefore, immigrant Jews avoid the broad and inhospitable (to them) country and settle in groups in the towns. As in the case of Ireland, centuries of bitter religious opposition have stamped their religious ideas deeply upon their minds, and only in the company of like-minded men do they feel that they breathe an air of freedom. They make their own little ghetto, which presently becomes a Jewry, and in time it contains so large a proportion of the inhabitants of a section of a city that these begin to have a peculiar value to their authorities in bargaining with politicians. A common reproach to the Jews is that he almost never becomes an agricultural producer. What has happened in Palestine has made this charge less common than it used to be but it was always foolish. What sort of reception would a Jewish immigrant have had in earlier days on the plains of Kansas or in the farms of Connecticut or Pennsylvania? And can you conceive a man bringing his family from some religion-drenched Jewish quarter of a German or a Polish city and wanting to settle in a Protestant village? His impulse is to join an existing body of Jews in a city and undertake badly-paid-work or open a small business with fellow-Jews. Until recent years it was common in the East of London, where Jewish immigrants settled, for a benevolent Jewish employer to receive and house new immigrants—and see for months if not years, that they did not learn sufficient English to try their fortunes further afield. But they were always provided with the spiritual consolation of their religion.

Even when, in recent years, they have in large numbers roamed beyond the traditional Jewish districts, they tend in self-defense to cling together in new groups, and their religion still isolates them. In the 20th century the hard old rabbinism has suffered like every other orthodox sect, but in many cases the more liberal rabbis of our time have followed the lead of the Catholic church and made considerable use of economic cement to hold them together. Speaking of experience in a suburb of London which has in the last 10 years received an amazing inflow of Jews, I should say that the half-dozen synagogues are zealous to help the economic interests of men who will at least put their names on the roll at the synagogue and attend at the special fasts and festivities. It does not tend to soften the social hostility of their Gentile neighbors. There is nothing in the boisterous cheerfulness of the Christian at his Christmas or Easter to stir prejudice, but when, at times, you see the neighbor who is familiar in the local drinking-shop light a number of Victorian candles in his dining room and sit with long face over a peculiar meal while his wife and daughter wait on him, when you note how he prepares for a hard fast by a gargantuan feast of eating and drinking, and he offers you the explanation that a few thousands of years ago imaginary priests ordered these things to commemorate imaginary events, you feel that even the modern Jew is isolating himself.

To more serious objections which anti-Semitic folk make, we will turn later, but in an age which has begun to think for itself, this servility to a remote past, and a past that is generally recognized by educated folk to be mainly a forgery, has a good deal to do with maintaining the antagonism. The rabbis prolong the isolation of Judaism just as much as Roman priests keep alive the feeling against Catholicism, and the ultimate basis in both cases is mainly economic. But in such an age as ours, when most of us regard these dead-hand practices and beliefs with general disdain, they cannot do more than reanimate the embers of an expiring hatred. Remember that it is not so much a problem of the Jew in America or in Britain that attracts serious attention. It is mainly the problem of the Jew in Europe. There the hostility writes itself in blood and torture, in ghastly concentration camps and the pitiful exile of hundreds of thousands from their homes, in the decimating of a whole race. Specific reasons are given for this which are said to be in accord with modern science and sociology. The fanatical persecutors talk about the need of racial purity, about commercial greed, about fantastic hidden plots, but these strained or insincere charges would not of themselves reconcile any modern civilized community to tolerate the singling out of the members of a single race for such brutal treatment as the Jews have received. There is a general attitude to the Jews which, however feeble it may have become as the age advances in humanitarianism, is still there for the incendiary to fan into flame. We shall see later what the grounds are alleged to be of modern anti-Semitism, particularly that variety which protests that it has nothing to do with religion, and we shall find them so indiscriminating or so false that the apostle of hatred is clearly appealing to some vague element in the mind of the community.

That this element is the fading glow of one of the worse sentiments of the Christianity which is passing away can hardly be doubted, but the responsibility of the Jewish religion itself must be admitted. In its strict form the orthodox Jewish religion is and always was one of the most provocative of religions. On the strength of a history of its earlier ages, which all historians now dismiss as fantastic, its adherents more intensely than the followers of any other religion believe themselves to be favored by God above all other men. They go so far in this that, unlike the members of most religions, they do not even seek to proselytize and share what they regard as the privileges of their religious position with outsiders. In the earlier phase of their civilization, when they had no specific belief in a future life and thought that the favor of the gods showed itself in earthly prosperity, this was, perhaps, natural enough. Why should their Jahveh reward the worshipers of Baal, Dagon, or Astarte? When they came to share with the Christians the Persian belief in an eternal life of happiness or suffering for all men yet continued in their indifference to others and in their self-containedness, their position inspired a peculiar kind of arrogance, yet to the outsider they seemed to have less ground for arrogance than ever. The boast that Judaism is the oldest religion in the civilized world is ironic. From our modern angle, the older a religion is the more primitive and absurd many of its characteristics are found to be; and the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Jews cling to these relics of the life of 2,500 years ago on the ground of a fictitious history which they call the Word of their God is not without influence on their dangerous isolation.

The outstanding feature of Jewish history in the last 200 years has been the slow drift westward of the race from Eastern Europe across the western countries and on to America. This at last gave an opportunity for that development of which Jewish scholars in many ages had dreamed—the softening of the rigid primitive features of the religion, the birth of a Liberal or Modernist Judaism. These Liberal Jews, mostly in the wealthy educated fringe of the body, often complain

that we ignore or are ignorant of this development. We do ignore it here because we are considering, not Judaism, but the problem of the Jew. They are not part of the problem. They are Americans and support Zionism only on behalf of their poorer brethren, especially in Europe. We might, in fact, point out that all but a small number of these more advanced Jews retain something of a Jewish complexion in their new synagogues and to that extent alienate their neighbors. But it is the millions of orthodox Jews in America and the millions of their unfortunate co-religionists in Europe who are the Jewish problem. They invite criticism, if not hostility, by the tenacity with which they cling to formulae, practices, and annual celebrations which the race generally outgrew 2,000 years ago. Yet they insist on regarding them as marks of superiority.

This is a contributory factor, but the main cause of that permanent general attitude to the Jews, even when it fades almost into unconsciousness, is the treatment of the race by Christians during the last 16 centuries. Ideas and sentiments are not inherited, but it is impossible to suppose that this bitter, and for centuries savage, hostility to the Jew on the part of the entire European population for more than a millennium has left no heritage in the broader sense. Some of us are old enough to have seen the continuity when the theological hostility, as such, was on the wane and modern anti-Semitism was still confined to special regions in Europe.

In the seventies of the last century I lived in Manchester, where there was already a large Jewish colony. No one then entertained any of those charges which the early anti-Semites were making in Germany any more than they entertained the dark charges that had been brought against the Jews in the Middle Ages. Yet the Jew who opened a small store or wandered about the city—most of the wandering glaziers, for instance, were Jews—entirely inoffensive and timid as he was, incurred general disdain and often suffered violence. Over and over again I saw groups of boys stone them and shout insults at them. Although "Who killed Christ?" was one of the cries, it was hurled at the Jew out of sheer custom and had no feeling behind it. The churches of the town were not responsible for it. Yet 15 centuries of sectarian hatred were faintly reflected in that apparently rootless general hostility—grown men would have stammered and been puzzled if you had asked them why they ill-treated the Jew—like a dull red haze lingering in the sky when the sun has gone down.

It is equally inevitable that this long and cruel history should still count in the general attitude of the Jew to the Christian. In our age, when every page of history that throws light on the less attractive features of life is torn out of the book or mendaciously rewritten, few have any idea of the enormity of the world's attitude to the Jews during 1,500 years. It is far better to face it and act accordingly. The Jew has a lot to forgive, the Christian a lot to make compensation for. This modern evisceration of history on the cry "Let bygones be bygones" is a trick. The historian who suppresses facts easily goes on to substitute lies for them. Let us first candidly consider these ugly facts and we will then more easily understand the conditions which explain the origin and spread of a bitter racial antagonism just when the world seemed to be growing more internationally conscious and more humanitarian.

II. THE GHASTLY CHRISTIAN RECORD

The first step in the falsification of history in regard to the relations of Jews and Christians is to say that in the early church, when men lived under the unadulterated influence of the new faith, the Christians were too virtuous to persecute the Jews. Some historian or apologetic writer invented a formula: that the leaders or Fathers of the Christian body, while shrinking sadly from a race that God had cursed because it had rejected and murdered the Messiah, would not sanction cruelty even to enemies, and indeed were not unwilling to see the Jews survive, scattered all over southern Europe, as living witnesses to God's just anger. This ought to seem strange to a reader of the Bible, who knows that within a generation of the alleged crucifixion the primitive communities, which consisted mainly of Hellenistic Jews, were rent by angry debates over the Jewish question. Every child in Sunday School knows how Paul fought Peter and the elders at Jerusalem. The main issue then was whether the Jews who accepted the Messiah should keep the cult and its blessings to their own race or, with Paul, appeal to the Gentiles. But this easily led to a fierce general controversy, of which we find ample traces in the older part of the Talmud, between Jews and Gentiles.

The Roman historian Suetonius says in his life of the Emperor Claudius (41-54) that he "expelled the Jews from Rome for continually rioting over Chrestos." Writers who deny the historicity of Christ make the rather fantastic suggestion that there really was a Greek named Chrestos who led one section of the Jews against another, but we have only to remember the conflict described in the New Testament. Christ was a totally unknown name to Romans at that time—his own followers called him "the Christ" (or Messiah)—and they would easily confuse it with the more or less familiar name Chrestos. At all events, this bitter feud of Jew and Christian is not questioned in either Jewish or Christian history. And it is amusing to reflect that the quarrel raged to the middle of the 2nd century or throughout just that period when the early Christian communities really were generally virtuous.

If in the next two centuries we find no "persecution" of Jews by Christians we do not seek an explanation in virtue. The Christians had neither the power nor the opportunity to persecute them. Indeed, Judaism was a "licit religion" in Roman law, and the Roman police would not tolerate assaults upon it by the Christians; if, in fact, the latter were more numerous. But to the Christians the Jews were "an accursed sect," and the seeds of hatred multiplied, to germinate rapidly in the soil of the 4th century, when power passed into the hands of the Christian bishops, and they who complained of 300 years of bloody persecution—another myth—entered at once upon the longest and most cruel period of religious persecution in the history of clericalism. Jews were excluded from and Christians admitted in crowds into state-service and the favor of the emperors; they were forbidden to build new synagogues or to marry Christians. The short reign of Julian put a stop for a time to this ill-treatment, and we may assume that the Jews, now restored to favor, did not show any sympathy to the Christians in their great reverse of fortune. So much the worse for them when, in a few years, Julian was killed and was succeeded by a Christian emperor and, in comparison with Julian, a loathsome brute. But we must remember that the great majority in every city were still pagans and, though the Romans and Greeks did not love the Jews, they had the protection of the civil law from violence. When

in the latter part of the 4th century the temples and synagogues were closed and all religions except the Christian prohibited by savage penal laws the shadow crept over Judaism. In many places they had the alternative of Christian baptism or death. The long martyrdom of the race, unique in the history of civilization, began.

Instead of selecting instances of persecution during the next seven centuries it is better to see how their fortunes varied with the general changes of the course of history. The apologetic claim is that from the early part of the 5th century to the latter part of the 11th they suffered remarkably little except under a few more or less barbaric kings who, being converted to Christianity, interpreted its spirit and teaching in their own way. The truth is, of course, that in the first half of the 5th century the Roman Empire fell with a crash, and in the inconceivable confusion and decay of authority that ensued we do not look for anti-Semitism. The Jews had been enabled by the peace and prosperity of the Roman Empire to spread westward as far as Gaul and Spain, but when we reflect that in a century after the fall of Rome the population of that city fell from a million to about 40,000 we wonder how many of the Jewish merchants survived the holocaust. However many there were, they were at first protected by the kings of the Goths and Vandals who took over the power of Rome. These tribes had by historical accident accepted Christianity in its Arian or less dogmatic and anti-Papal form. The noblest of them, Theodoric, who tried to save civilization, gave complete freedom to the Jews. But in the 6th century less civilized Teutonic kings (Spain, Italy, etc.) were converted to the Roman version of the faith and, as the Greek half of the empire in the east simultaneously lapsed into at least semi-barbarism, a harsh, bloody persecution of the Jews raged, with few exceptions, from the Atlantic coast to Persia.

This grim application of ecclesiastical dogmas—it is pleasant to find that the famous Pope Gregory I opposed violence but perhaps not invidious to add that this contributed to his immense wealth—lasted about a century and a half, and then the Jews had three centuries of comparative freedom. To represent that this means that the spirit of Christ triumphed at last over the confusion of civilization and the passions of the barbarians is a mockery of which any responsible writer ought to be ashamed. During those three centuries Christian morals, especially at Rome, sank to their lowest depth, and the monarch who most protected the Jews and employed them in offices of state, Charlemagne, defied Christian law in his life and the authority of the Popes in his empire. The plain truth is, as historians acknowledge, that while the bishops, when they cared for anything beyond their pleasures and vices, still pressed for the application of the church laws and the social ostracism of the Jew, the princes and nobles—and indeed most of the bishops—welcomed them as the bearers of luxuries that barbaric Europe could not itself produce. Not only had industry sunk to an appallingly low level but there was little money in circulation. But Constantinople, while barbarized in character, still had considerable art and wealth, and through the Lombards of North-Central Italy, who were far higher in culture than the Romans, the Greeks maintained a trade with that region and, through it, with Germany. From the 5th century onward the Arabs in turn developed their art and culture, and to the end of the 9th century had a rich civilization in Spain, which opened up a trade-route to France. It is sheer nonsense to say that the Dark Age has been redeemed from our heavier reproaches. The general condition to about 1050 was barbaric, but the princes and nobles—and the leading prelates and abbots were generally nobles—squeezed money out of the people and welcomed the luxuries of the south. An ecclesiastical historian says of the best writer of the 10th century, the gay Bishop Iutprand, that "the obscenities in his work betoken a profound corruption," but it is largely a gilded corruption. The more virtuous Bishop Raterius speaks with scorn of "the horses with gold and silver

trappings . . . the beds encrusted with gold, and with silken covers" (which dainty women share with them) of the great majority of his fellow-bishops in North Italy.

The Jews were, for the overwhelmingly greater part, the agents of this luxury trade between the highly civilized Arab world and the Greek markets on the one hand and semi-barbaric Europe on the other. Trade routes were opened across Russia to Scandinavia and across Asia to China. In the standard history of Europe in the Middle Ages ("the Cambridge Medieval History," vol. vi) we read that "few can have rivalled those 9th-century Jews who are said to have journeyed constantly from Frankland (France) to China." A Persian official of the 9th century has left us a remarkable picture ("The Book of the Ways") of their activity. Still more important and more frequented was the route from North Italy, to the ports of which fleets came from the East, through Germany to the Baltic and from Spain through Barcelona to France and later to England. In the Arab civilization of Spain itself, and in all parts of the Arab-Persian world where the faith was mellowed by a large degree of Skepticism and a love of wine, art, and beauty, the Jews had a golden age, the happiest and most prosperous in their history. Of their 80 communities in Spain a large number had more than 20,000 members, and they co-operated, socially and commercially, with the Arabs on equal terms. They had princely synagogues, colleges, and immense wealth. They were used as ambassadors and ministers of state, and their daughters married Arabs and enjoyed all the social freedom, culture, and luxury of the Arab women. Mohammed had, when the Jews of Arabia joined his opponents, turned bitterly against the race, but Arab families which scoffed at his claims captured the Caliphate and gave ideal toleration.

Graetz's classical "History of the Jews" acknowledges this golden age, but it is at this important stage poor history-writing, and the Jews of America would do well to have an adequate work written on their spendid record from the 8th century to the 12th. This was the time when the foundations of the new Europe were laid. That the Christian religion had any material part in this is nonsense. There were several factors, mainly economic, but none was more important than the activity of the Jews as intermediaries with the southern civilization. Not only did they take the silks and velvets, the brocades and washable linen (to that time unknown to the Christians of Europe), the gold, ivory, and jewels, the scientific, surgical, and musical instruments, the drugs, perfumes, soaps, and carpets, of the Arab markets all over Europe (crossing to England after 1066), but they were almost the only merchants who could lend the nobles and prelates the money to buy them, for the church still condemned all money-lending as a mortal sin. How many today would not learn with astonishment that large numbers of the beautiful old abbeys and some of the cathedrals were built on funds borrowed from the Jews? Aaron of Lincoln, the greatest banker in England in the 12th century, lent more than \$1,000,000 (in modern values) for such purposes. The Jews even in large part financed the early Crusaders who, we shall see, turned upon them with terrible brutality.

I have not space here to do more than touch the fringe of this great chapter of Jewish history, which is still to be written adequately, but it is essential to notice it. You have in it a brilliant reply to even some modern criticisms—as that the Jew is always a parasite and a bad mixer—and also the explanation why during these centuries most princes, many bishops, and even some Popes favored them. Catholics boast that four or five medieval Popes protected them. As I have shown in detail elsewhere—see Appeal to Reason Library—they were either paid to do so by rich Jews or they were otherwise indebted to them. Medicine and chemistry had perished in Christendom but had made great progress in the Arab world, and, as the Arabs shuddered at the idea of leaving their sunny and dear Andalusia for the bleak north, it

was the Jews who became the physicians of Popes and princes and gouty prelates. They it was who founded, at first as medical colleges, Europe's first universities (France and Italy) and took to England the teaching of "science" which made Friar Roger Bacon seem to his fellows a wizard. To the small, filthy, cramped cities of France and Germany they brought descriptions of spacious Arab-Spanish cities, with acres of beautiful gardens and populations of a quarter of a million to a million educated and prosperous citizens. . . .

But on this deeply important and sadly neglected point of the position of the Jew in the early Middle Ages and his great share in the rebuilding of civilization in Europe I must be brief. We are tempted to think that if it had not been for the religious fanaticism that developed among the Jews themselves, in Christendom (in new orders of monks and the Inquisition), and in the Moslem world, the problem of the Jew might then have been solved by the civic absorption, as men of other races were absorbed, of the Jews in the various nations of Europe. Almost wherever piety remained or reappeared there was danger of the Jew. Profoundly religious men like Bernard of Clairvaux who nevertheless condemned violence to the Jews were rare. But giving too much importance to religion in either the rises or falls of civilization is a mischievous fallacy.

The broad fact that we have next to notice is that the early Crusaders made the first breach in this long prosperity of the Jews and inaugurated a new era of persecution. That is a commonplace of history, but the modern gloss on it—that, lamentable as the fact may be, it was natural that bodies of armed men moving in deep Christian piety to redeem the grave of Christ should be embittered against his "murderers"—is a lie like most of our modern, especially American, glosses on medieval history. In serious history the Sunday-school glamor of the Crusades was stripped off long ago. The hordes of hundreds of thousands of French and Germans who moved across Europe in the first Crusade were, as a recent historian says, "the scum of the population;" and this is true, with few exceptions, whether you refer to the peasants or the knights and nobles, who were then nearly all dissipated bandits. The Pope himself in proclaiming the Crusade pointed out to the knights that the great wealth of the Arabs was a prize worth fighting for. There was widespread Skepticism in the knightly order and large numbers of them were heavily in debt to the Jews, partly to outfit themselves for the campaign. The masses of the footmen doubtless had plenty of religion of the medieval type, but they were out for loot and adventure, and they needed little persuasion to fall, looting, raping, and murdering, upon "the enemies of Christ" in their midst. Monks raised the cry and they cut a bloody swathe across Germany. The monks even forged a letter in the name of Jesus directing the Crusaders to fall upon the Jews wherever their friends the princes did not effectively prevent this. The archbishops, all of the noble class, were just as indebted to the Jews and many of them—they were then rulers of cities or provinces—offered shelter to the Jews in their fortress-palaces. In most places they put up a weak defense, and in city after city the Jewish community was drowned in blood. At Mayence 1,300 men, women, and children perished in the archbishop's palace. Men slew their own wives and daughters, or they killed themselves, to escape the brutal raping. Historians are not eager to point out that a prelate's debts to the Jews were wiped out when the Jews were ruined or slain. When the emperor called for toleration, Pope Clement III protested that they had "profaned the sacraments."

For half a century after the first Crusade the Jews slowly recovered from their wounds and built up a new prosperity. Then in 1149, as the Moslem had easily recovered Jerusalem from the vicious and effeminate descendants of the first Crusaders, the call rang out once more; and once more, though not to the same extent, the Jews were the first victims. The reigning Pope Eugenius III declared in his Bull that all

debts of knights who took the cross were cancelled, and, as the Jews were still almost the only money-lenders, their losses were colossal and the feeling against them increased. One of the myths of the time is that St. Louis, King of France, who was one of the leaders of the campaign, protected the Jews and showed the genuine spirit of Christianity, though the most famous abbot of the time, Peter of Cluny, urged him against "these blasphemous Jews" in a letter that we still have. The truth is that the king's councillors restrained him in the financial interest of the country. The personal attitude of the "gentle" Louis was that the only argument to use against a Jew who criticized Christianity was to "plunge your sword into his belly as far as it will go." He confiscated all their wealth, and horrible massacres followed.

Meantime their fortunes in Spain itself had been steadily declining. As the Arab stock in the Peninsula lost its vigor Moslem fanatics from Africa gained power and numbers, and in 1085 the Spaniards, summoning to the plunder of the rich Arab cities the burly knights of France and taking advantage of the split between the liberal Andalusians and the Moors from Africa, captured Toledo and its large and rich Jewish community. The Jews still prospered in the south of France where, under Spanish Arab influence, a rich and enlightened little civilization had been built up. But it was not even Christian, and it was completely and savagely destroyed by "Crusaders" in what is called the Massacre of the Albigensians (1207-11).

The Church was now nearing the zenith of its power in Europe, and the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) it restored and enforced all the old laws against the Jews. They became social pariahs and were generally compelled to wear ignominious colored patches or caps lest a good Christian—this 13th century was one of the most immoral in history—held commerce with them. Even a Christian prostitute must be warned by this badge that she must not contaminate herself by intercourse with a Jew. Charges of ritual murder, followed by massacre or batches of executions, now multiplied. Such charges were not unknown in the early church but now one had only to find a Christian child murdered by an unknown and the cry went up that it had been killed in the Jewish ritual. Now also what is called "the real presence" of Christ in the consecrated host was made a dogma by the church, and as in places some of these stored wafers acquired—it is suggested—a red mildew or mold, the theory went round that the Jews had stolen and stabbed a host and it had miraculously bled. Communities of Jews were fined enormous sums or even burned in their houses; and the Inquisition had now begun its bloody career. This 13th century, of which Catholics boast so much, was not only one of the loosest in sex-morals but one of the most cruel, and the Jews were amongst the worst sufferers.

The economic development again counted. The great art of the Middle Ages, which now began, was just a symptom of the economic recovery of Europe but the Jews had less part in it. They were still amongst the great merchants and bankers of Europe but Italians and others defied (as regards money-lending) the teaching of the church, and merchants multiplied everywhere. The Jews still found princely patrons and protectors if only for the reason that the church itself held that the money they accumulated might justly be seized by Christian princes or magistrates. In church and secular law they were described as "the slaves of the treasury," and the express ground of this was the crime of their fathers in killing Christ.

The greatest of the 13th-century theologians, Thomas Aquinas, is now represented to America, especially since the French Catholic philosopher Maritain found a profitable refuge there, as a man of profound and all-surpassing moral genius. What did he say about these outrages? We have still amongst his works a letter he wrote to the Duchess of Brabant in reply to questions about the Jews. Her ministers proposed in the customary manner to confiscate the wealth of the rich Jews of Belgium but they sought to make sure first that they could

do so in full harmony with church-law as interpreted by the leading saint and scholar. Thomas's replies are a piece of pitiful wriggling. On the main point he is disgustingly dogmatic. He says:

"The Jews are on account of their sins placed under perpetual slavery to the princes, and therefore their property may rightly be taken, provided things necessary to life be not taken."

The great moralist allows them to retain their lives. When he is reminded that most of their money comes from loans he trims badly. The duchess might compel them to get money by honest work. But as he knows quite well that such money would be regarded by the treasury as chicken-feed he ends with the sophism: "In the words of the Apostle, many things are lawful which are not expedient." I translate direct from the Latin letter. American Catholics are not eager to let folk, especially American Jews, know that according to this supreme oracle of their moral theology the Jews are "the slaves for ever" of Christians and may legitimately be relieved of their wealth.

Under that sentence they dragged out the Middle Ages. The night deepened for them while the splendor of medieval art increased. Before the end of the century, after batches had been hanged or torn by wild horses, they were—16,000 of them—expelled from England. A few years later they were expelled from France. In Germany they suffered more massacres—many threw the blame of the Black Death on them—and were expelled from most provinces. Even the Swiss began to persecute. In Spain they had what a modern historian calls "the grandest and the saddest hour of their modern history." The last trace of Moorish rule was swept away and the Inquisition got busy. Thousands were burned alive: hundreds of thousands had to submit by force to the kindly Christian faith. Still Torquemada pressed and forced the king to give them the alternative of baptism or exile (without taking with them any of their gold or silver). Nearly every land in Europe was closed to them. The Portuguese offered them, for a high price, a shelter only for a few months. Catholics boast that Pope Sixtus IV generously welcomed them to Italy but in the chief Catholic life of the Pope it is plainly stated that it was their money he wanted. "He protected the Jews," says Baron von Huber, "in order the better to take advantage of them." The Vatican detested the Spanish Inquisition. The money it seized remained in Spain. Yet a vast number, variously estimated at from 300,000 to 800,000 quit, almost penniless, the land they had enriched. Except that Italy admitted large numbers to a precarious life, they had to wander East from the Europe which they had done so much to redeem from barbarism.

I need not run over the later history. Protestantism did little for them. "The Jews are brutes," Luther said, "their synagogues are pig-styes and ought to be burned." As a Protestant historian says:

"That the Reformation itself had nothing to do with subsequent ameliorations in the condition of the Jew is only too plain from the fact that in many parts of Germany, Protestant as well as Catholic, their lot became actually harder than before. . . . During the whole of the 17th and the first part of the 18th century the hardships inflicted on them by the German governments positively became more and more grievous. What really caused the change in their favor was the great uprising of human reason that marked the middle of the 18th century."

Nevertheless it was Protestant countries like Holland and England that first recovered a sense of justice while Catholic countries generally remained bitter against them. France relaxed its attitude only at the Revolution. It was the growing revolt against clericalism that led to a perception of the injustice, though we will not forget that this revolt had better conditions for spreading in Protestant than in Catholic lands. Above all, we must not forget the economic factor.

Most folk will remember one of George Arliss's best films in which the early history of the Rothschild family is told: The Jews were again becoming rich bankers or money-lenders, and the rapidly increasing cost of war and industry gave money a new value. In such circumstances nations discover, as the Empress Livia did 2,000 years ago, that "money does not smell."

III. MODERN ANTI-SEMITISM

Historians generally count the Modern Age as beginning about 1550. I have in several works pointed out that the grounds they assign for this are unsatisfactory, and that, if we insist that the Middle Age is over—I wonder if all historians of the next century will admit this—we should date the close in the second half of the 18th century. That would certainly be the sentiment of the Jew of the time. Except in Holland where, true to the nature of religious fanaticism, they had already begun to persecute their own heretics (Spinoza, etc.) and in England, they still groaned under the Christian curse. They had generally moved east from the holy atmosphere of Europe and lived in tolerated poverty under the shelter of the Moslem, the Turks and, in large numbers, in Poland (then part of Russia) and the Baltic provinces under the equivocal protection of the Greek Orthodox Church, the ignorant masses of which could at any time be inflamed against them.

From these frontier lands, the bolder spirits were now venturing out into the richer countries of the west. It may seem harsh or eccentric to compare their migrations to the westward movement over the great American plains, but after their experiences of the past 500 years would not their general feeling be something like that of the men who pushed out amongst the Redskins and rattlesnakes or that of the men whom the lure of gold moved to brave the terrors of Alaska? On the other hand, the general sentiment of the Gentiles, though in theory they now generally recognized that even Jews came under the new charter of the Rights of Man, was one of a disdain or hostility that had almost forgotten its own grounds. Too few writers appreciate what we might call the psychological atmosphere of the 19th century in this respect because the sectarian influence that so rigidly controls history-writing in our time gets the facts suppressed just like the facts about the vices of the monks and clergy. The American Jews would, as I said, find it useful to issue a full and picturesque history of their race from the time of Charlemagne to the 20th century; but they will not do so out of fear of injuring their political alliance with Catholics. Democracy has many advantages, but freedom is not conspicuous amongst them.

In the introductory note I recalled how, as liberal culture grew in Germany after the recovery, scholars like Lessing could plead for common sense in relations with the Jews, some of whom were already making a cultural and social mark in Germany. The Napoleonic wars and the reaction that followed disturbed this development. The early story of Heine reminds us of the conditions. He found it necessary to profess to be converted to Christianity in order to get full social tolerance and professional advancement. Conversion became common in Berlin. By 1820 there were more than 3,000 Jews in the city and more than 1,200 of them professed Christianity. They would all probably have repeated with Heine: "If the law had allowed me to steal silver spoons I would not have been baptized." However, in spite of the lingering prejudice the westward tide continued, and it was not unnatural that such of these Jews as took any political interest in their new world—we certainly do not blame any of them at this stage for concentrating on making money—joined the growing radical movement. As everybody knows, two of the three founders of Socialism, Marx and Lassalle, were middle-class Jews. And because they shared the aspirations which rose to a flood-level in the revolutions of 1848 they shared also the bitter experiences of the reaction in 1849 and after. Anti-Jews had a new weapon: the names of Marx and Lassalle.

For the next phase, the rise of modern anti-Semitism, was even more clearly determined by economic conditions than the anti-Semitism of the Middle Ages. The Christian religion still counted for a lot in backward countries besides that it was the momentum of the long Christian tradition that explained the vague general hostility to the Jew. The Germans and Britons of the 19th century were not disposed to fly into a rage because the Jews had killed Christ 1,900 years earlier. Many of them were sorry only that the ancient Jews had not buried him beyond the hope of resurrection. But in Eastern Europe, where the illiterate were 80 to 90 percent and the Christian religion survived in all its purity and vigor, you could still fire a crowd with the cry; especially if, as generally happened, most of the crowd owed more than they could ever repay to Jewish money lenders. It is a classical method of evading loans to "burn the tablets," and the easiest way to do that is to burn the Jew's houses with him inside it. In the lifetime of many of us there have been massacres or "pogroms" in Russia, Hungary, Austria, etc., that would have done credit to medieval crowds.

With this old type of persecution I am not here concerned. It is the new anti-Semitism, which culminated in the appalling Nazi holocausts, that we consider now. It began in Germany about 1870. Flushed with its victory over France, the last act in the expansion and unification of the German Empire, Germany at once developed that dangerous pride in the German race which has proved so potent a poison. Certainly no other nation in Europe had made such remarkable progress since the fall of Napoleon. Britain had advanced more in some respects, but France did little more than hold its own and Italy had only just begun as a unified nation and was held back by political corruption. Berlin in particular had ground for pride.

But the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine had dangerously increased the Catholic proportion, and Bismarck, supported by the Liberals, the capitalistic middle class, entered upon a struggle with the Church. The rich Jews, who had enormously multiplied in Germany, were the natural allies of the Liberals and the natural enemies of the Catholics. But Rome found a way of convincing the new emperor, who became known to all the world as "the Kaiser," that the real enemy was Socialism and the Catholic Church was his best ally against it. The Jews were now isolated, and the envy of their wealth that had for some years fostered an anti-Semitic sentiment became formidable. In 1863 the Belgian anthropologist Count Gobineau had issued a work, "Inequality of the Human Races," which, on the strength of an imperfect knowledge of history, unduly glorified the Aryan race. This had led to a lot of pamphlets and small works contrasting the Aryan and the Semite, and the cry spread in Germany that Aryan blood should not be contaminated with Jewish. There had been a good deal of intermarriage and still more mixture of blood without official sanction. German historians, brooding over the historic achievements of their race, confirmed the pride. As all races in Europe are Aryan (except the Finns and Magyars) many preferred to say that it was the Nordic race that was so precious. But this in turn included Danes, Swedes, and Norwegians, so above all they glorified "German blood."

Historically and scientifically the whole business was absurd. There are, as I have said, no pure races, and the mixture has been a good thing for progress. Every American ought to know that. The original Prussians were Slavs and were for centuries refractory to civilization. The western (Charlemagne, etc.) and southern Germans had, it is true, made fine efforts to restore civilization, and they had built up a great empire (the medieval Roman Empire), but from the Thirty Years War onward there had been an enormous adulteration of German blood. In any case the early Aryans had been for centuries refractory to the civilization which the Semites as well as the Egyptians had built.

We need not enlarge on that point as the racial cry of the anti-

Semites was more of a pretext than an ideal. The German Emperor saw both Catholicism and Socialism—especially the latter—growing in the last years of the century and he politically discouraged anti-Semitism. The so-called Christian Socialists of Germany had taken up the anti-Semitic cause, and from them it passed to the Christian Socialists of Austria and lingered in Catholic Bavaria. The theological virus was now again openly mated with the economic, for these so-called Christian Socialists were, like the Catholic parties which have re-assumed the name in Europe today, Catholics who were used by the church to save itself from the inroads of Socialism by adopting semi-Socialistic phrases. Pope Leo XIII sent his blessing to the anti-Semites (mostly Catholics) of France in 1882 and later, when these were exposed and discredited, partly by the freethinking novelist Zola, to the strong and bitterly anti-Semitic movement in Austria. Catholic Munich and Vienna, the breeding grounds of Nazism, were its chief centers at the beginning of this century.

The Catholic Church had again become the most dangerous enemy of the Jews. Organized as such, under a purely religious label, the Catholics could no longer count upon a majority in any country of Europe. Poland was still part of Russia, and Italy and Spain were drifting away from the Vatican every year. In most countries they were losing heavily to the Socialists, and the defensive weapon they employed, though it stank in the nostrils of the prelates and the nobles, was to set up a "true" or Christian, as opposed to atheistic, Socialism (as it then was everywhere). And the safest method of making some pretence of Socialism was to attack the Jewish capitalists. Both as manufacturers and financiers the Jews had had brilliant success during half a century, and there was a good deal of jealousy to appeal to. It was easy to raise the cry that the Jews aimed to get control of civilization through their control of the financial world. As late as 1920 we saw how this worked in the case of a big American capitalist, the late Henry Ford. His *Dearborn Independent* made violent attack on the Jews and amongst other things solemnly endorsed the legend of a century earlier. A third-rate German writer of fiction had imagined his hero listening to the Jewish Elders concocting such a plot in a Czech ceremony by night. The account was expanded and published by a Russian as a serious discovery in "The Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom," and it appears that White Russians who wanted Ford's wealth enlisted in the holy task of destroying Bolshevism persuaded him that this long-discredited piece of European anti-Semitism was to be taken seriously. Until Trotsky was driven out of Russia the Bolshevik plot was commonly said to be Jewish.

There were, of course, contributory factors. Hitler ingenuously gives one in the early part of his reminiscences. Crowds of Jews were pouring in from the East, where anti-Semitism had assumed the savage medieval form, and he asks us to imagine himself—he was then a verminous bum—and the refined Viennese shuddering at the idea of absorbing these crowds of shaggy and unclean aliens. At Munich he sang a different song. It was the rich Jews who roused his Aryan ire: the men who monopolized the money of honest Germans to live in bloated luxury in the cities and the mountain-resorts and to debauch Aryan girls. He had himself rarely done an honest day's work. I suggested years ago, and still hold it probable, that while he lived his hobo life as a young man in Vienna (where at first he sponged on the Jews) he contracted syphilis from some cheap Jewish prostitute. It seems to be the best explanation both of his physical condition and his hatred of both Jews and prostitutes; and his doctor has now admitted that he contracted syphilis and impotence. Another reason might be that while he had completely failed to gain entrance to the art school he saw numbers of Jewish boys pass the examination. It is well known that both in Austria and Russia the high proportion of Jewish youths and girls who gained admission to the universities alarmed the middle class, the church, and the authorities.

The story of anti-Semitism in Russia is different and ought to be considered by the Jews themselves. It was two freethinking Russian monarchs, Peter the Great and Catherine, who gave them shelter in that country from the vicious persecution in the west. Catherine, it is true, shrank back into conservatism when she saw how liberalism led to revolution in France. But she had had her son and successor trained by French humanitarian Skeptics, and he combined a good deal of their sentiments with the orthodoxy and imperialism he inherited. The Jews had not a bad time in Russia until the assassination of the autocratic Alexander II in 1881. Jewish youths had again helped the rebels and suffered with them. Over and over again the dense, illiterate, orthodox masses of the people were fired to attack them and anti-Semitism thrived until the Bolsheviks came to power. The anti-Semites of America grossly exaggerated the Jewish element in the Bolshevik party. The same men who talked of a plot of Jewish financiers to capture civilization professed to believe that Bolshevism was mainly Jewish, though it was the deadly enemy of international finance. But it is waste of time to look for logic in anti-Semitism. The point we would ask the Jews to note here is that, just as they had had to wait first for Arab Skepticism or Liberalism and then for the Skeptics of the 18th century to relieve them from the Christian tyranny, so in our own time they are less afflicted by anti-Semitic pressure in atheistic Russia than in any other country.

There is no need here to follow this modern anti-Semitic movement to its full and baleful flowering in the Nazi and Fascist persecution. Never before in history had the Jews suffered as much, or one-tenth as much, as they suffered in 10 years of our Age of Enlightenment. That, some will say, had nothing to do with Christianity. They may be invited to reflect on the fact that when the 11 surviving leaders of the Nazi movement faced execution five were found to be Roman Catholics and five Protestants; and Mussolini had been a practicing Catholic for years before the end. It is more important to notice that neither Church protested while the barbarities were being perpetrated. I made this point in the course of a lecture at Oxford in 1946, and an Austrian Catholic who had been in the concentration camp of Dachau and was present assured the audience that Cardinal Faulhaber had in a little volume of his published sermons made an eloquent protest as soon as the outrages began. This was, like a dozen other of the man's statements, a lie. I went carefully once more through Faulhaber's book on my return. His only quarrel with the Nazis was, like that of the Protestant champion Niemoeller, doctrinal. The Pope made a broad protest when Hitler invaded Poland, not because he fell so brutally upon the Jews but because the Vatican saw the most loyal of all its subject-countries swept away. And when Mussolini in turn passed his hardly less cruel sentence of expulsion upon the Jews, the Pope had nothing to say; though with refined brutality Mussolini dated the expulsion at the time of the Pope's coronation. Here again Catholics have ventured to take me up and protest that only alien Jews were expelled. They forgot to say that Mussolini turned them into aliens by annulling the Italian citizenship of those who had been nationalized. They refrained from remarking that it was a few rich Jews that the Church protected. The Italian paper, *La Vita Italiana*, complained in October, 1941, that Italian Jews are strongly favored and protected by the Catholic Church and that *wealthy* Jews in Italy are very influential." Over the 10,000 who were expelled, beggared, homeless, and suffering, he shed no tears. He remained on cordial terms with the butchers.

IV. THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT

What we might call popular anti-Semitism, that of the man who does not belong to any organized opposition but "hates the Jews" on the ground of his own experience, may be discussed in the next chapter. It will be convenient just to describe how Jewish feeling in this century has found dramatic expression in the Zionist movement. Naturally there were Zionist aspirations amongst the Jews in earlier ages. Even amidst the distresses of the Middle Ages the Messianic faith included the dream that when the Anointed One came he would smite the Gentiles and lead his people to take triumphant possession of the Holy Land. But with the changed political conditions of the latter part of the 19th century and the appearance of a large body of wealthy Jews in America while millions of poor Jews suffered in Europe the aspiration became a definite movement.

Between 1899 and 1931 about 2,000,000 Jews entered the United States as emigrants, and the immense body of them brought scars from the struggle in Europe and left friends or relatives behind. Zionism became a secular as well as religious aspiration. Various offers or suggestions of territory—the British government at one time made an offer of part of Uganda—were turned down. Colonization societies multiplied, then blended in a Palestine Colonization Society. The first World Zionist Congress was held at Basle in 1897, and it founded the World Zionist Organization with the definite aim of setting up Zion once more in Palestine; though, of course, it was now far from being entirely a religious movement.

Palestine was until the First World War a neglected and unprofitable corner of the Turkish empire, but it will be as well to go far back over its early history. The Arabs say that it is *their* country; the Jews claim that it is *theirs*; and the general public has no clear idea or knowledge to enable it to judge. It is unfortunate that, as the papers in our time are determined to appease any and every form of religion that has any influence in America, and Mohammedanism has little or none, the general public is misled.

Orthodox Jews make their claim on the ground of a version of ancient history that is totally rejected by modern historians. Their fathers were a branch of the Semitic race which filled the Arabian peninsula and had periodically to send a wave out to the north or the east because the population outgrew the means of subsistence in the lonely desert country. So much is clear. But the Jewish sacred books makes the Hebrews, an earlier name than Jews, reach Egypt in their wandering, then turn back into the desert under a leader named Moses, who was on good terms with their special god Jahaveh, and receive a promise that Jahaveh would give them, to be theirs forever if they were faithful to him (to his priests), the land which we know as Palestine. And about the year 1500 B.C. they reached Palestine and, with the help of many miracles and remarkable heroism, took the land from its inhabitants and, with many picturesque vicissitudes, including a long captivity of most of them in Babylonia, lived there until the Romans turned them out nearly 1,600 years later. The Arabs came in six centuries later and the Turks still later.

On the law of conquest, if we recognize it, this would be a pretty good title-deed to Palestine if it were not a forgery, as it certainly is. It is rather amusing to read even a modern history of the Jews and observe how the writer slips over the thin ice of their early history. Like

so many historians today he has one eye on what is now generally agreed to have been the true or the most probable course of events and one on the effect that, to adopt this, would have on the circulation of his book. But the situation is worse in the general press. Abraham of Ur of the Chaldees—Ur was not a Chaldean city, in fact the Chaldeans had no cities, until more than 1,000 years later—must be mentioned as respectfully as if he was as historical and important as Abraham Lincoln. Moses and Joshua are as definite as Roosevelt and Eisenhower. In short the papers to which the ordinary American looks for guidance on this question of the rival claims of the Arab and Jew warp his mind by endorsing the fraudulent title of the orthodox Jew. The editor may take the liberty of ignoring such minor details as the giving of Palestine to the Jews by Jehovah, or he may find Balfour's promise of it much more important, but the story of the Hebrews conquering Palestine in the 15th century before Christ and holding it, with one interval, for 1,500 years must not be challenged. Yet in the opinion of all modern authorities on ancient history it is a piece of fiction, and it has to be ignored in considering the modern problem of the Arab and the Jew.

The general opinion is that between 1200 and 1000 B.C. various Semitic tribes, probably only distantly related to each other, reached the hilly frontiers of Palestine and fought for a foothold in the fertile valleys. One tribe, which had a primitive variation of the sky or mountain-peak god who came to be called Jehovah or Jahaveh, seems in time to have taken the lead but the common name of them, the Hebrews, apparently means only that they were "the folk from beyond the river" (Jordan). Palestine, or the southern part of Syria, had at that time been in the possession of other Semitic peoples (or mostly Semitic) for certainly over 1,000 years, and the situation seems for centuries to have been something like that of the mountainous northwest frontier of India where half-civilized hill-folk led a primitive life and made bloody raids upon the plains. Historians allow that David may have been a successful leader of these bands of raiders about 1000 B.C. But Palestine, unlike India, has only some 30 miles or so of good land between the hills and the sea, and the people of the plains were divided into small national groups, so in time the Hebrews pushed farther and farther west. They split themselves into two small kingdoms, one of which came to be known as that of the Jews. These held the lower and poorer half of Palestine, an area not nearly as big as Maine, from about the 8th or 7th century B.C.

But in expanding toward the sea they straddled the main route between Egypt and the great civilizations of the north. Along this route the first cavalry legions with iron arms had passed southward to the conquest of Egypt a thousand years earlier, and now the imperialistic armies of Egypt were pouring north to meet the Assyrians. The Jews had to choose sides, and they lost. In short, they had been civilized only a century or two when first the northern and then the southern kingdom was swept away. For a century or more the depopulated land returned to semi-barbarism. When it was restored the Jews were subject to Persia (539-332) then to the Greeks who conquered Persia (332-323), then to the Ptolemies of Egypt (323-198), then to the kings of Syria (198-167). After a long war of emancipation they again set up kings of their own but it lasted only about a half century. The Romans took over the kingdom of Judaea, and, after repeated rebellions, destroyed Jerusalem (A.D. 70) and after another revolt drastically punished the Jews and scattered most of the survivors over the Greek-Roman world. In the 7th century, in fine, the Moslem took the rule over from the Greeks and, with a short interlude (Crusades), have held it ever since until 1917.

We are therefore no more prepared to say that Palestine belongs to the Jews by right of conquest than by divine gift; and the theory that they have some sort of moral right on account of "hallowed associations," as the newspapers say, is chiefly based upon legends about Solomon and

his temple. Indeed a distinguished modern authority, Dr. Roth, has ventured to say that in destroying this territorial basis and scattering them over the world the Romans rendered service to the Jews themselves. "Perhaps in the long run," he says in "The Cambridge Medieval History" (VII), "the nation gained its powers of expansion and resistance through the loss of territory." One wonders whether the Jews, if they had retained Judea, would have made more progress than the Arabs did. There are, at all events at this level of peoples, no higher and lower races—both Jews and Arabs are Semites in any case—and the causes of the backwardness of the Arabs—isolation from the main area of civilization and religious fanaticism—would probably have had the same results whoever held Palestine.

So we dismiss altogether the theory that Palestine normally belongs to the Jews and ought to be handed over to them; though it is well to remember that four-fifths of the European Jews who are struggling to return to it appeal implicitly to the orthodox version. A more serious question is whether the British nation, which is a sort of caretaker and virtual ruler of the country, did not promise to hand it over to the Jews. During the First World War, when Germany and its allies with their great advantages of a central position seemed not unlikely to win, the western allies made desperate promises to small nations who would help to turn the scale in their favor. The rule of Turkey still extended over Palestine, and it was necessary for Britain to have the goodwill and assistance of both the Arabs and the Jews. They made promises to both, and both complain that they were double-crossed. We are concerned only with the promise made to the Jews by Mr. Balfour on behalf of the British government. This constantly-mentioned and rarely-quoted "Balfour Declaration" was made in a letter to Lord Rothschild on November 2, 1917, and it runs:

"His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object; it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

The fact that this declaration was never ratified by the British Parliament need not be taken into account. It pledges Britain as far as it goes. But how far does it go?

It is easy today when there is so little difference in the number of Arabs and Jews and the cultural and industrial superiority is overwhelmingly on the side of the Jews to suggest that Balfour must have meant that the Jews should be permitted to immigrate in sufficient numbers to get the majority and the control of the administration. I should doubt if such a possibility occurred to the British statesmen of 1917. Of a total population of 689,281 only 125,000 were Jews. The rate of immigration and the backward state of the country at that time would hardly bring before any man's mind the situation which we confront today. When the tide of Jewish immigration rose rapidly—the increase of the Jewish population by 416,000 between 1922 and 1942 was to the extent of 80 percent due to immigration—the British Colonial Secretary made a public reminder (1930) that Britain had pledged itself to "safeguard the rights of *all* the inhabitants of Palestine," and in 1936 a White Paper published by the government said that it was now necessary to restrict the flow as there was now "no margin of land available for agricultural settlement by new immigrants." Still they saw no great future for the country. It has no minerals except stone and few exports except fruit and oil.

On the other hand, it might be argued that the reservations which the British government attached to its promise in 1917 and renewed in 1933, that no concession to the Jews must infringe the rights of the Arabs, might be held to prove that there was no intention of allowing

sovereignty to pass into the hands of the Jews. In that case the statement that the Jews should find "a National Home" in Palestine was ambiguous, and one understands the anger of the Zionists. Considering the character of Balfour, which was high, I do not believe that he had a share in any deliberation deception. Britain was still imperialistic and Balfour and most of his colleagues were Conservatives. It seems probable that they did not envisage a date at which Britain would consider surrendering to the League of Nations the mandate over the small and backward country that was entrusted to it. The land had great prestige in the Christian world and in strategy. On the whole it seems not improbable that they meant that while Britain controlled the administration they would so widen the gates of immigration that the Jews could occupy, exclusively, a large part of the territory and there, protected from any shade of persecution, could if they wished, speak their own language and live freely according to their own traditions and religion. It would be quite easy to defend the other or strict Zionist interpretation of the Declaration; and just as easy to quote other promises made during or at the close of the 1914-1918 war that were either not fulfilled—not a line of the score of promises made by the joint Liberal and Conservative authorities to the British people themselves was ever realized—or were entirely mischievous in their fulfillment. Versailles notoriously sowed the dragon's teeth.

No one certainly had the dimmest prevision of the future development. In 1917 and for a few years, especially when the Russians gave complete freedom to the Jews, there seemed to be only a question of finding an outlet for large bodies of poor Jews from their overcrowded and miserable quarters in Eastern Europe, and the Zionist movement seemed to be mainly an organization of wealthy international Jews to assist them to move to the free air and healthy conditions of Palestine. Both factors changed rapidly and materially. From 1933 onward the Nazi and Fascist menace to the Jews of Europe became an increasingly appalling reality, and the zeal and strength of Zionism rose. Then came the Second World War and the attempt to exterminate the Jewish race in Europe. The problem became formidable, and the world-organization by Zionism, now necessarily chiefly located in America, backed by all the wealth and political bargaining power of the American Jews, and encouraged by the extensive and violent anti-British elements in American life, advanced to the final assault on what it called British perfidy. Meantime the Arabs, amongst whom also there had been a considerable educational movement during the 30 years, plainly saw that unrestricted immigration backed by American capital meant that they were, to adopt the language of the Jews themselves, to lose *their* country and pass under the rule of a non-Moslem majority. Far bigger issues than the interpretation of the Belfour Declaration had arisen.

V. TOWARD A SOLUTION

This problem of Palestine is only a part of the general problem of the Jew. No one can dream of a day when, even if all other nationalities were expelled—if that is conceivable—Palestine would house more than a fraction of the Jewish race. Already it has a population exceeding that of Maine by hundreds of thousands, yet the area of Maine is three times as large. The future of Palestine itself is uncertain at the time I write this. President Truman made the declaration that America would force open the gates for Jewish immigration—gates which were, he knew, guarded by the warships of America's closest ally—and Britain, in despair, is laying the whole question before UN, which in turn is controlled by America. That particular problem has taken on a new aspect. A more imperious incentive than the promise of either Jahveh or Mr. Balfour or the "sacred associations" of Palestine for either Jews, Arabs, or Christians has come into the field: the security of American property (oil) and a new basis for America's anti-Russian strategy. How this tangled skein will be unravelled it would be foolish to attempt to predict, but there is one factor to be considered that the American press does not urge upon the attention of its readers.

This is that since the Balfour Declaration was issued the problem may have been secularized one one side but religion has entered into it as violently as ever from another. The various fragments of the Arab race have drawn together and have, through delegates in repeated conferences during the past two years, declared that they are as much interested in the defense of the sovereignty of their co-religionists in Palestine as the Zionists of America. Britain, and France are in transferring power from them to the Jews. And since they base their action on community of creed rather than community of race, Moslem nations further afield are in sympathy with them.

There are about 25,000,000 Moslem, mostly of the Arab race, well organized in national groups, from Persia to Morocco. These plainly threaten war if the Arabs of Palestine lose their sovereignty by forcing immigration until the Jews have an effective majority. Beyond these are at least 15,000,000 Moslem in Turkey and more than 50,000,000 in India who have expressed their sympathetic interest in the Arab position. It would be little use trying to appease them by proposing to divide Palestine into a Jewish and an Arab half. It seems to them that the Jewish section, backed by Jewish-American capital, would not long be content with half the country, and in the event of a civil war the Arabs would certainly appeal to the Arab Federation outside Palestine and the Jews just as certainly appeal to America. Moreover the Jews, if successful, would probably aim to enlarge their National Home by annexing Syria and the Lebanon, and this would bring France and Turkey into the quarrel. And in view of, not only the wide belief in a plan of Jewish financiers to control the world but certain fanatical Jewish groups in America and elsewhere, which boast that they will do this when the Jewish nation is firmly established in its own country, there would be a dangerous revival of anti-Semitism in all countries.

These uncomfortable possibilities or tendencies remind us that the problem of Palestine is only part of the general problem of the Jew. Whatever the solution of that particular problem may be, a National Home of the Jews in this small country will leave the enormous majority still scattered over the earth. Even today most of these do not

want to emigrate to Palestine, and when the propagandist zeal in Europe of American Zionism has come to the end of its funds the situation will be that every country they will be far more concerned to come to agreement with their Gentile neighbors and share their prosperity than to emigrate to a new Judea in some remote part of the world.

Doubtless zealous Zionists will differ. A man's estimate of such a situation is necessarily colored by his environment. My own is to a great extent Jewish. I live in the most pleasant part of suburban London and the Jews have concentrated in it during the past 10 years. Of 100 families on this street on which I live, about one half are Jewish. Scarcely 10 were when I settled on it. But there is no Zionist zeal amongst them. Even those who came, penniless, during the war dread the prospect of being sent back to Belgium, Holland, Germany, Poland or Austria. Yet they face an increasing and bitter anti-Semitism in England.

The man who wants to have a just opinion on the subject must begin always with two facts: the Jews are the only race in the civilized world today without a land of their own, and they have a unique memory of 1,500 years of bitter injustice from their Christian neighbors. These facts and the psychological consequences of them explain why they do not merge into the population of the land in which they settle as easily as other bodies of immigrants do. There are many times more Irish or Germans (to speak of race only) in America than there are Jews, yet, when the Irish do not antagonize their neighbors by religious fanaticism and until so many of the Germans were found a few years ago to be plotting against the country that fed and sheltered them, they merge without difficulty into the national life. There are, as I said, at least 12,000,000 folk of Irish descent outside Ireland yet, in spite of the irritating arrogance of their church, there is no anti-Hibernian movement.

The general conditions of the solution of the problem are the same both in regard to Palestine and for ending anti-Semitism elsewhere. No one who knows anything about life in Nearer Asia today can doubt that the federated 20,000,000 Arabs will never allow Arab predominance in Palestine to be destroyed by unrestrained immigration. The militant Zionists have, in fact, developed a great zeal for nationalism just when the world at large has begun to realize that the excesses which it is so prone to breed are one of the great obstacles to the peace of the world. The plan to end war which Versailles was supposed to realize in 1919 was hopelessly vitiated by nationalism. Nazism and Fascism were morbid outgrowths of it, and in our own post-war period it causes the gravest difficulties; in the Trieste region, the frontiers of Greece, Poland, India, Nubia South Africa, and Farther Asia, America is hoping that all the countries of Europe will so far forget their long history as to sacrifice their national sovereignty sufficiently to form an effective United States of Europe or accept the authority of a World Federation. Is this the time to ask it to embark, with great risk of war, upon the task of setting up a new national sovereignty? Co-operation is the ideal which 10 years of horrors have most of all impressed upon our generation.

For such co-operation the Jews have themselves to remove or tone down features which militate against it. One of these is their ancient religion. Americans happen to know better than others that there has been a great growth of liberalism or modernism in the Jewish body in the last quarter of a century, but even in America the main body of the Jews cling to a ritual, a calendar, and a creed that ought to have perished in the Jewish dispersal and enlightenment of 2,200 years ago. An orthodox Jew will be indignant at the idea that interference with his religion is a condition of better relations, but at least he must recognize that it is a separative element and encourages the suspicion that the Old Testament and the Talmud still obstruct good relations of Jew and Gentile. But even "reformed" Jews and often men and

women who never enter a synagogue retain too much of this obsolete stuff. A man is alienated from them afresh when he finds that a neighbor who has rejected the really sacerdotal influence of the rabbis nevertheless on certain occasions lapses into surprising practices which commemorate only elaborate fictions of the priestly schemes who built up the cult of Jahaveh 2,300 years ago. There are mischievous traces of nationalism even in the most advanced synagogues. The very name "rabbi" is somehow more inflammatory even than "priest."

Language is another and worse element. The Jews in Palestine have restored Hebrew to the rank of a modern language, but, although it has been considerably enlarged and adapted to modern uses since I studied it at Louvian University 60 years ago, it is a pity to add one more tongue to our babel just when the social student is trying, in the interest of world-peace, to create a demand for an international language. But it is the persistence of Yiddish that is the chief rock of offence. This tongue, partly Hebrew and mainly German, developed in South Germany 600 years ago, ought to have been suffered to die out when the Jews spread westward from the confining and hostile conditions of Eastern Europe, yet a few years ago it was found that even in America 40 percent of the Jews spoke Yiddish. The only virtue I have heard my Jewish neighbors claim for it is that in their quarrels, which are many, Yiddish supplies stronger verbal missiles even than Elizabethan English. The way in which the Jews maintain it as their daily speech in the poorer quarters of cities where they cling together in tens of thousands is decidedly an isolating element. In America they ought to be advised by their own authorities to educate themselves out of it as speedily as possible.

These corporate links of creed and language which are peculiar to the Jews go far to explain the civic and political isolation which in turn gives some offense. One of the chief causes of the growth of anti-Semitism in British cities in the past 10 years is this.

But it is of little use at present making suggestions. We are passing through a period of lowered moral standards throughout the world and can do little in the settlement of problems for the solution of which moral qualities are essentially required. The main purpose of this booklet is rather to explain to the non-Jewish reader the conditions which give the Jew an exceptional position in a modern community and to point out to the Jew these features of his communal life which tend to prolong the estrangement. In particular I proposed to recall in summary, since it is now generally falsified or suppressed, that thousand years of savage Christian intolerance hardened the Jew in his isolating features. Religious myths and passions dug the gulf between Jew, Christian, and Arab. They drew together and co-operated whenever belief in those myths was softened by Skepticism. They will enter into full and friendly co-operation only when the myths disappear and pure humanism is the base of man's standard of conduct.